

FORCIPOMYIA MEIGEN, 1818 (INSECTA, DIPTERA):
WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION FOR DESIGNATION OF
A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

Z.N.(S.) 1079

By the Secretary, International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

In 1975 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 32: 38-40) Professor D. Elmo Hardy applied to the Commission for the use of the plenary powers to designate *Tipula bipunctata* Linnaeus, 1758 as type-species of *Forcipomyia* Meigen, 1818. It was then thought that Westwood's (1840, *Syn. Char. gen. Brit. ins.*: 126) designation of that species as type through *Labidomyia* Stephens, 1829 was invalid because he synonymised the two genera with a "?". It followed from that conclusion that Coquillett's (1910, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* vol. 37 (1719): 545) designation of *Ceratopogon ambiguus* Meigen, 1804 as type-species was valid. Since *C. ambiguus* is a nomen dubium that may not even represent a species in the same family as *Forcipomyia*, this would have been a most unfortunate treatment of this economically important genus.

2. Dr Sabrosky has written (24 January 1977) to the Secretary to argue that Westwood's type-species designation in 1840 was in fact valid, and his position now seems to me to be the correct one. Having noted that (as stated by Professor Hardy) *Labidomyia* Stephens, 1829, is a replacement name for *Forcipomyia* Meigen, 1818, and that its type-species was designated by Westwood (1840: 126) as *Tipula bipunctata* Linnaeus, 1758, he went on: "Under Article 67i, both original nominal genus and its replacement must have the same type-species, and fixation for either applies also to the other automatically, provided of course that the type-species is 'eligible for fixation as the type-species of the earlier nominal genus.'"

"To me it follows inescapably that the type-species of *Forcipomyia* is *bipunctata* through the operation of Code Article 67i, without necessity of action by the Commission.

"When you[i.e. R.V.M.] wrote to Professor Hardy on 1 December 1959, you found it 'impossible to claim that Westwood (1840) designated the type-species of *Forcipomyia* through *Labidomyia*, because he cited the former only as a doubtful synonym (with a ?) of the latter'. I do not agree, for two reasons:

"(a) in my opinion, Westwood's question mark did not refer to the synonymy but to the authorship - Meigen? rather than Megerle was his query, because Stephens had cited Megerle. Granted that the real meaning of question marks is obscure in many cases, but note Westwood's use on: 125 in connection with another of the Meigen-Megerle names: '*Palpomyia* Meig.?, Steph.'. Here there is no question of synonymy; the question can only be about Meigen as author because Stephens had cited Megerle.

"(b) Even if Westwood did question the synonymy, as you concluded, that is irrelevant here. The essential facts are that Stephens substituted *Labidomyia* for *Forcipomyia*, and Westwood designated the type-species of

Labidomyia, choosing a species eligible to be the type-species of *Forcipomyia*. Ergo, under Article 67i, he thereby fixed it for *Forcipomyia* also."

3. Dr Sabrosky pointed out that Edwards (1926, *Trans. ent. Soc. London*: 395) had come to the same conclusion by applying Article 30f of the old *Règles*, the direct predecessor of the present Article 67i. The central point in the argument is the demonstration that the meaning of Westwood's "?" is immaterial. I can see no argument against his view.

4. I have therefore written to Professor Hardy with a copy of this note to suggest that the application be withdrawn, and he has agreed with this suggestion.

DROMAIUS VIEILLOT, 1816 (AVES): CLOSURE OF CASE Z.N.(S.) 1668

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature

In 1965 Drs Serventy, Condon and Mayr published an application for the placing of *Dromaius* Vieillot, 1816 on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 22: 63-65). This name had been spelled as *Dromaius* and as *Dromiceius* by Vieillot in 1816; the applicants held that Vieillot himself in later works (1817, 1826) had acted as first reviser and had chosen *Dromaius* as the correct original spelling. It is not disputed that the case falls under the provisions of Article 32b of the Code concerning multiple original spellings.

2. In 1967 the Commission voted in favour of the application, but Dr. Holthuis and Dr. Sabrosky questioned whether the first reviser had been correctly identified in the application. They pointed out that Vieillot did not fulfil the requirements of the Code in either 1817 or 1826. Dr. Sabrosky added that it might well be found that the true first reviser had in fact chosen *Dromiceius*, in which case his choice could only be altered by the use of the plenary powers. As it was obvious that the Commission's decision had not been soundly based, it was decided to defer an Opinion until the first reviser had been correctly identified.

3. In April 1976 Dr. G.W. Cottrell (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass., USA*) wrote as editor of the second edition of Peters's *Check List of the Birds of the World*, vol. 1, to enquire what progress had been made with the application by Serventy, Condon & Mayr. I told him of the history of the case and immediately began a new search for the first reviser. I found that G.R. Gray, 1840, *A list of the genera of birds*: 63 had cited both original spellings of the name and had clearly used *Dromaius* as the valid one. His text is reproduced as Fig. 1. On the evidence available to me, he is therefore the first reviser. The automatic application of Article 32b decides the issue and there is no call for Commission action. The case is thus closed.